

Florida Department of Environmental Protection—Environmental Performance Measurement System

Information for this summary is taken from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Office of Strategic Projects and Planning website: <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/ospp/report/intro.htm>.

For more information on the Florida Environmental Performance Measurement System, please contact Stephen Adams of the Florida Department of Environmental Protection by phone at 850-921-6227 or by email at stephen.adams@dep.state.fl.us.

Background

The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) began an ambitious effort to implement performance measurement across all agency programs in 1996. The Florida Environmental Performance Measurement System (EPMS) is a comprehensive environmental measuring system, equipped to assess the status of environmental quality, identify areas of concern and develop tailored interventions. By applying standards to the task of managing large and varied ecosystems, the goal of EPMS is to produce promising results for Florida by significantly increasing industry compliance, give the public the chance to view the quality of the environment, and hold government and regulated entities accountable. The EPMS, through the *Secretary's Quarterly Performance Report*, provides information to legislators, decision-makers and the public for activities, compliance rates and outcomes for air and water quality, habitat conservation, solid and hazardous waste management, and public drinking water systems. Available on the Internet, the report addresses both the state's need to know and the public's right to know about the quality of the environment in Florida.

Methodology

The Secretary's Report is composed of a four-tiered measurement system used to evaluate the agency's performance in meeting its mission. This tiered system is designed to provide information about the relative health of natural resources while providing the necessary context within which to evaluate the changing conditions of those resources. This tiered methodology is currently being evaluated as part of an overall program evaluation of the EPMS by Florida DEP, in a report that is yet to be released.

- ⇒ Tier 1: Environmental and Public Health Outcome Indicators that track long-term trends in the condition of Florida's natural resources, public health and general environmental quality.
- ⇒ Tier 2: Behavioral and Cultural Measures that track compliance rates, best management practices, volunteerism and other behaviors that impact environmental quality.
- ⇒ Tier 3: Department Outputs and Activities that track the traditional measures of program performance, such as numbers of inspections, numbers of compliance assistance activities, or numbers of violations.
- ⇒ Tier 4: Resource Efficiency Measures that track the agency's budget, the cost of services, and the cost effectiveness of interventions used to solve environmental problems.

The tiered format of the Secretary's Report provides the framework for problem identification and solution. Changes in a given issue at the Tier 1 level can be better understood in light of the information provided by the lower tiers. The second tier relates measurements of behavior to the changes in the

quality of the resource, such as the state of compliance for all regulated facilities. The third tier details the specific activities of the agency, while the fourth tier provides an assessment of the costs associated with conducting those activities. This "tiering" of performance data is aimed at understanding the underlying causes of problems and to design appropriate interventions.

Within each edition of the Secretary's Report, an executive summary is provided in which interested readers are able to see the Secretary's views on the results of the tier measurement system. The summation of each major program segment contains the most important aspect of the Secretary's Report: the use of "Good, Watch, and Focus" designations by the Secretary.

- ⇒ "Good" areas are those in which outcomes are being achieved and the associated programs are performing well.
- ⇒ "Watch" areas are those in which the data show a moderate cause for concern. Such situations suggest the presence of an emerging trend or pattern and require further investigation prior to taking specific action.
- ⇒ "Focus" areas are those that require immediate attention. Upon nomination as a Focus area, the responsible program provides the Secretary with further details and an action plan to address the issue.

Highlights from the November 2000 Interim Performance Report

Presented below is an example of the tiering system used in one programmatic area, the Beaches & Coastal Systems. It is based on this interim data and the tiers that the Secretary makes a designation regarding programmatic performance.

Beaches & Coastal Systems

Tier 1— Environmental and Public Health Outcome Indicator

Habitat Conservation and Protection

| Percent beaches that provide upland protection, wildlife or recreation according to statutory/rule requirements | FY 96-97 | FY 97-98 | FY 98-99 | FY 99-00 | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----|-----|-----|
| | | | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
| | N/A | N/A | 72% | 72% | 77% | 77% | 77% |
| Percent critically eroded beaches under management plan and the percentage on which erosion has been reduced or reversed | FY 96-97 | FY 97-98 | FY 98-99 | FY 99-00 | | | |
| | | | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
| | N/A | N/A | 42%* | 42% | 43% | 43% | 43% |

*as reported in Q4 98/99

Tier 2— Behavioral and Cultural Measures

Regulatory Compliance

| The significant compliance rate among coastal construction control line (CCCL) and joint coastal protection (JCP) permit-holders as determined by physical inspection. | FY 96-97 | FY 97-98 | FY 98-99 | FY 99-00 | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|-------|-----|
| | | | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
| ⇒ CCCL | N/A | 99.6 | 99.6 | 99.8% | 93.5% | 95.0% | 91% |
| ⇒ JCP | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Tier 3— Departmental Outputs & Activities

Permitting

| The number of permits processed | FY 96-97 | FY 97-98 | FY 98-99 | FY 99-00 | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----|-----|-----|
| | N/A | 1689 | 1506 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
| | | | | 304 | 523 | 424 | 455 |

Tier 4: Resource Efficiency

| Program Resources | 1996-97 | 1997-98 | 1998-99 | 1999-2000 |
|----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Legislative Appropriations | | | | |
| ⇒ General revenue | 3,331,452 | 3,520,108 | 3,870,142 | 4,084,955 |
| ⇒ Trust funds | 506,208 | 564,951 | 1,277,394 | 959,565 |
| ⇒ FCO | 46,927,073 | 32,125,486 | 36,950,221 | 20,000,000 |
| Total | 50,764,733 | 36,210,545 | 42,097,757 | 25,044,520 |
| Staffing | | | | |
| FTE Staff | 68 | 68 | 74 | 74 |

This information will receive a designation by the Secretary in the next Quarterly Report. For an example of how the Secretary examines tiered data and makes a designation, please see below for another highlight from the interim performance report that discusses a 1999 "Focus" designation in one program area.

Public Health and Safety—The rate of observed compliance among community and non-transient, non-community public water systems based upon bacteriological sampling has remained consistently within the upper 90% range over the past three years. Bacteriological compliance among transient non-community systems has improved from 94.3% in FY 1997-1998 to 96.1% during the last fiscal year. A Focus designation was placed on non-drinking water systems within this classification for the Northeast and Central Regulatory Districts in the Spring of 1999. The action plans implemented by each district have increased the observed rate of compliance in both districts. The observed rate of compliance based upon physical inspections at all classes of public water systems totaled 88.6% in FY 1999-2000, down four percentage points from FY 1998-1999, but above the 86.5% compliance rate of FY 1997-1998. Both permit processing and inspection levels have increased over the past three years. Compliance assistance has grown as well, up from 2,384 contacts in FY 1996-1997 to 3,242 in FY 1999-2000.

Next Steps

In May 2000, FDEP Secretary David Struhs challenged agency staff to develop the next generation of performance management within the FDEP. To meet this challenge, a two-pronged evaluation was launched to record the lessons learned to date and to assess the still unmet needs of all agency managers and staff. The evaluation, soon to be released, examines a brief history of performance measurement at FDEP, discusses the outcomes of the evaluation with special attention to the methods employed, as well as provides a discussion on the shape of the next generation of performance measurement in Florida. For information on this pending evaluation, please contact Stephen Adams of the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.